arXiv:1412.1849v2 [cond-mat.mtrl-sci] 19 Dec 2014

Coexistence pressure for a martensitic transformation from theory and experiment: revisiting the bcc-hcp transition of iron under pressure

N. A. Zarkevich,[1] and D. D. Johnson[1,2*]
[1] *The Ames Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy, Ames, Iowa 50011-3020 USA; and*
[2] *Materials Science & Engineering, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011-2300 USA.*

The coexistence pressure of two phases is a well-defined point at fixed temperature. In experiment, however, due to non-hydrostatic stresses and a stress-dependent potential energy barrier, different measurements yield different ranges of pressure with a hysteresis. Accounting for these effects, we propose an inequality for comparison of the theoretical value to a plurality of measured intervals. We revisit decades of pressure experiments on the *bcc* $\leftrightarrow$ *hcp* transformations in iron, which are sensitive to non-hydrostatic conditions and sample size. From electronic-structure calculations, we find a *bcc* $\leftrightarrow$ *hcp* coexistence pressure of 8.4 GPa. We construct the equation of state for competing phases under hydrostatic pressure, compare to experiments and other calculations, and address the observed pressure hysteresis and range of onset pressures of the nucleating phase.

PACS numbers: 64.70.K-, 05.70.Fh, 02.70.-c, 81.05.Bx

I. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge of the equation of state is crucially important in materials science and engineering, metallurgy, geophysics, and planetary sciences. However, equilibrium coexistence of phases during a pressure-induced martensitic transformation is extremely difficult to realize experimentally, and most shock and anvil cell experiments contain various amounts of a non-hydrostatic, anisotropic stress. Hence, an improved understanding of transformations arises when we can better compare idealized theoretical results to realistic experimental data. A long-studied case is iron (Fe), our focus below, but the results remain quite general.

Iron is the most stable element produced by nuclear reactions at ambient pressure, and one of the most abundant elements in the Earth. Thus, magneto-structural transformations[1–28] and high-pressure states[29–69] in iron attract enormous interest, especially in geophysics because iron is a primary constituent of the Earth's core,[29–164] many meteorites,[164–173] and, due to its properties and availability, most steels.[174] At low pressure P and temperature T, the α-phase of iron is a ferromagnet (FM) with the body-centered cubic (bcc) structure. At higher pressures, iron transforms to the ε-phase with hexagonal close-packed (hcp) structure of higher density that is non-magnetic or weakly anti-ferromagnetic. This transformation is martensitic,[3] and the bcc-hcp equilibrium coexistence pressure is difficult to determine unambiguously experimentally (Table 1).

A martensitic transformation between bcc (α) and hcp (ε) phases can be characterized by four pressures (Table 1 and Fig. 1): a *start* and *end* pressure of direct $\alpha \to \varepsilon$ ($P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{start}$, $P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{end}$) and reverse $\varepsilon \to \alpha$ ($P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}_{start}$, $P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}_{end}$) transformations. Because martensitic stress is present in the anisotropic hcp phase but not in the isotropic bcc phase, we suggest the inequality

$$P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}_{end} < P_0 < P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{start} \qquad (1)$$

for the $\alpha - \varepsilon$ equilibrium coexistence pressure P_0 and the observed hysteresis, rather than an inaccurate simple average[3]

$$P^{avg.}_{start} = \frac{1}{2}\left(P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{start} + P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}_{start}\right). \qquad (2)$$

While shock and anvil-cell (AC) pressure experiments give different averages (2), they satisfy the more appropriate inequality (1), see Table 1 and Fig. 1d. Additionally, we calculate the hydrostatic equation of state (EoS) of α and ε Fe, determine P_0 via common-tangent construction, which should be thermodynamically relevant to purely hydrostatic (equilibrium) AC experiments, and compare the result to experiment.

II. BACKGROUND

Previous Experiments: Shock and AC pressure experiments are the major approaches to measure pressure-induced transformations, although hydrostatic conditions are often difficult to assess. Experimental onset (start) and final (end) pressures for $\alpha \to \varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon \to \alpha$ transformations are summarized in Table 1, which show a large span and the reason to revisit this issue.

For completeness, we highlight the experiments and their outcome for iron. Bancroft *et al.*[1] studied propagation of compressive waves generated by high explosive in Armco iron and reported a polymorphic transition at 13.1 GPa. Balchan and Drickamer[2] used a high-pressure electrical resistance cell and found a sharp rise in resistance of iron at 13.3 GPa. Giles *et al.*[3] showed that this bcc-hcp transformation is martensitic; their estimate of P_0 by $P^{avg.}_{start} = 10.7 \pm 0.8$ GPa differs from the earlier reported $P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{start} = 13$ GPa, often quoted as the martensitic start pressure. Mao, Bassett, and Takahashi[5] performed XRD measurements of lattice parameters of iron at 23°C at pressures up to 30 GPa, and suggested a bcc-hcp shear-shuffle model. (Their Fig. 3 is reproduced in

Ref.	Year	$P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{start}$	$P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{end}$	$\Delta P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}$	$P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}_{start}$	$P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}_{end}$	$\Delta P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}$	Expt.
[1]	1956	13.1						shock
[2]	1961	13.3						resistance
[3]	1971	13.3	16.3	3	8.1	4.5	3.6	AC
[4]	1981	13.52	15.27	<2	9.2	6.74	2.5	powder
[4]		15.21	15.47	<1	10.23	8.5(6)	2	foil
[6]	1987	10.8	21	≈10	15.8	3	13	Au
[7]	1990	10.6	25.4	14.8	16	4	12	Al_2O_3
[7]		10.7	21.6	10.9	16.2	3.7	12.5	Au
[7]		12.4	17.8	5.4	12.2	4.8	7.4	NaCl
[7]		12.8	17.2	4.4	11.8	5.5	6.3	CsI
[7]		14.3	17.5	3.2	11.9	7	5	m-e
[7]		14.9	<15.9	0.5	<11	>7	<4	Ar
[7]		15.3	15.3	0.1	10.6	8.0(6)	2	He
[9]	1991	8.6	23	≈14	[9.5]	7.7	3.6	hydrostatic
[11]	1998	13.0	18.6	≈5.6	[10.3]	6.6	7.4	XAFS
[12]	2001	13	17	≈4	8	5	3	bulk
[12]		11	14	≈3	7	1	6	nano-Fe
[13]	2005	14	16	2.4				AC
[14]	2008	10	22	≈12	8	4	4	powder

TABLE I: Start and end pressures [GPa] with width $\Delta P = |P_{end} - P_{start}|$ for iron bcc (α) – hcp (ε) direct and inverse transformations. Type of experiment (Expt.) specifies shock or anvil cell (AC), form of sample (bulk, foil, powder), or pressure medium (He, Ar, m-e for methanol-ethanol, etc.) in the AC. The $P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}_{1/2}$ values at half-transition (50% bcc + 50% hcp) are in the square brackets [$P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}_{start}$ column].

Ref.[6].) Bassett and Huang[6] applied a non-hydrostatic pressure with an uncontrolled shear strain (known to produce pressure self-multiplication)[175] and confirmed an atomic mechanism[5] of the bcc-hcp transition, but omitted discussion of changes in volume and magnetization in their shear-shuffle model. Zou *et al.*[4] used solid He as the pressure medium in their diamond AC (DAC) experiments on iron (99.95 wt.% Fe) powder pressed into a plate and on a folded section of a 10 micron foil; they pointed at the uniform non-hydrostatic stress as a possible cause of differing data.

Importantly, transition pressure estimates depend on how hydrostatic the applied stress is and sample size. For example, Bargen and Boehler[8] found that the pressure interval of the forward bcc→hcp transition increases with increasing non-hydrostaticity (transition pressures and hysteresis width change systematically with the shear strength of the pressure medium).[7] The best pressure medium is a superfluid; a good one is a gas or a fluid with a low viscosity; the worst one is a viscous fluid or a solid. Due to grain boundaries[176] and melting-freezing waves,[177] solid helium (He) can behave as a superfluid.[178]

Taylor *et al.*[9] focused on the large hysteresis and used a DAC up to 24 GPa; as pressure is increased, Fe is fully converted to hcp at $P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{end} = 23\,\mathrm{GPa}$. Upon reducing pressure, half of the hcp transforms to bcc by $P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}_{1/2} = 9.5\,\mathrm{GPa}$, while a small ε-Fe remnant is present at $P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}_{end} = 7.7\,\mathrm{GPa}$. They report $P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{start}$ values from 8.6 to 15 GPa[9]. Using a radial diffraction DAC with infrared laser heating on Alfa Aesar (99.9% pure) Fe powder (10^{-5} m particle size), Miyagi *et al.*[14] reported appearance of hcp at 10 GPa that fully converts near 22 GPa, while bcc appears at 8 GPa during decompression. Jiang *et al.*[12] studied grain-size and alloying effects on the transition pressure, finding that $P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{start}$ shifts from 13 GPa in bulk to 11 GPa in nano-crystalline samples (15 nm average grain size with a range of 10-30 nm). Wang, Ingalls, and Crozier[10] performed an XAFS study at 23°C up to 21.5 GPa; a mixed-phase region was found between $P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{start} = 13$ and $P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{end} = 20\,\mathrm{GPa}$, and between $P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}_{start} = 15$ and $P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}_{end} = 11$ GPa. Later, Wang and Ingalls[11] used XAFS with a sintered boron-carbide anvil cell to measure lattice constants and bcc abundance versus P, and reported $P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{start} = 13\,\mathrm{GPa}$ and $6.6 \le P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}_{end} \le 8.9$ GPa. Using *in situ* EXAFS measurements and nanosecond laser shocks, Yaakobi *et al.*[15] detected hcp phase and claimed that the $\alpha \to \varepsilon$ transition can happen very quickly.

Finally, the change of magnetization along a transition path is important, where there is an abrupt 8–10% volume decrease at the transition state[6,13]. Baudelet *et al.*[13] combined x-ray absorption spectroscopy (XAS) and x-ray magnetic circular dichroism (XMCD) on a sample in a CuBe DAC and found a transition at 14 GPa, with a $2.4 \pm 0.2\,\mathrm{GPa}$ width of the local structural transition and a $2.2 \pm 0.2\,\mathrm{GPa}$ width of the magnetic one; they suggest that the magnetic moment collapse lies at the origin of the structural transition, and slightly precedes the structural one.

Previous Theory Results: Former bcc-hcp equilibrium pressure calculations provided values of 13.1 GPa[19], 10.5 GPa[24] and 10 GPa[25], in apparent agreement with the experimental values of $P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{start} = 13\,\mathrm{GPa}$[1–3] and $P^{avg.}_{start} = 10.7 \pm 0.8\,\mathrm{GPa}$[3]. However, those calculated



FIG. 1: Figure 1. (a) Energy [meV/atom] relative to bcc at 0 GPa and (b) pressure [GPa] versus volume [Å^3/cell] for hydrostatically relaxed 2-atom unit cells of bcc FM (black), hcp NM (blue) and AFM (green), and fcc NM iron (orange); with DFT values (dots) and least-squares fit to the Birch-Murnaghan EoS (lines). Common tangent construction (red line) yields $P_0 = 8.42$ GPa. Vertical dotted lines are guides to the eye. (c) Enthalpy difference [meV/Fe] between hcp and bcc phases versus pressure [GPa] (inset shows a larger range). (d) Comparison of the calculated $P_0 = 8.42$ GPa (vertical red line) with experimental data from Table 1, represented by $[P_{end}^{\varepsilon\to\alpha} - P_{start}^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}]$ horizontal segments. Except for the 1991 hydrostatic experiment[9], most diamond anvil cells[3,6] provided uniaxial or highly anisotropic pressure.

pressures disagree with later experimental data (Table 1). Using *ab initio* molecular dynamics (MD), Belonoshko *et al.*[86,179–183] considered shear at the Earth's core conditions[87,88] and constructed an EoS for α[40,182] and ε[183] Fe. Wang *et al.*[23] studied nucleation of the higher-pressure hcp and fcc phases by classical MD simulations employing an embedded atom method (EAM) potential, and found that the transformation happens on a picosecond timescale; their calculated transition pressure is around 31-33 GPa for uniform[23] and 14 GPa for uniaxial[22] compression (but there is no magnetization in the EAM potential). Caspersen *et al.*[26] showed that presence of a modest shear accounts for the scatter in measured transformation pressures, affecting the hysteresis. Johnson and Carter[19] used a drag method in a rapid-nuclear-motion (RNM) approximation and obtained an unphysical discontinuous jump in atomic shuffle degrees of freedom, giving a very low bcc-hcp barrier; they found that bcc and hcp phases have equal enthalpies at the calculated pressure of 13.1 GPa.

Liu and Johnson[20] directly constructed the potential energy surface in a 2-atom cell for the shear-shuffle model[6], allowing changes of lattice constants and (continuous) atomic degrees of freedom; although hydrostatic pressure cannot produce shear, pressure does affect the potential energy surface and barriers. They reported ≈9 GPa for bcc-hcp coexistence; the calculated kinetic barriers along the transition path were 132 meV/atom at 0 GPa with an estimated minimum (maximum) onset pressure of 9 (12.6) GPa, 119 meV/atom at 10.5 GPa with a min (max) onset at 8.1 (13.8) GPa, and 96 meV/atom at 22 GPa with a min (max) onset of 6.6 (10.2) GPa. That is, there is an expected 3.6 to 5.7 GPa hysteresis width depending on kinetic pathway (and volume fluctuations). In addition, they showed that drag methods decouple degrees of freedom incorrectly, as confirmed later by a proper solid-solid nudged-elastic band method[184].

Recently, Dupe *et al.*[185] reconsidered the transition mechanism within the same shear-shuffle model[6], but incorrectly fixed the volume at 71.5 bohr^3/atom (no moment collapse allowed), and used the RNM drag method to compare energies of three shuffling mechanisms at constant shear and volume. Friak an Sob[24] in a 4-atom cell considered non-magnetic (NM) and antiferromagnetic (AFM) orderings along a predefined path (which were almost degenerate); their energy-volume common-

tangent gave coexistence P_0 at 10.5 GPa[24].

III. PRESENT RESULTS

To determine P_0 of equilibrium coexistence of FM bcc and NM hcp phases, we calculate volume V, energy E, and enthalpy $H = E+PV$ (Fig. 1) at various hydrostatic external pressures P. Each unit cell is fully relaxed at a given P. All atomic forces and all non-diagonal pressure components remain zero due to symmetry. Diagonal pressure components are the same by symmetry in bcc and fcc phases, while their difference does not exceed 0.03 GPa in hcp. Magnetization of the FM bcc reduces with pressure and collapses to zero at ≈900 GPa; hcp magnetization is set to zero at all pressures.

The slope of the common tangent to the $E(V)$ curves in Fig. 1a gives P_0 of 8.4 GPa (a more accurate result than in[20], where the focus was on transition barriers); this pressure gives zero enthalpy difference in Fig. 1c, and is compared to all experiments in Fig. 1d. The previously calculated values of 13.1 GPa[19] and 10.5 GPa[24] do not agree with all the experimental data, summarized in Table 1 and Fig. 1d.

To obtain these results, we used the Vienna ab initio simulation package (VASP)[186–188] with generalized gradient approximation (GGA)[189,190] and projector augmented-wave (PAW) potentials[191,192]. We use 334.88 eV energy cutoff for the plane-wave basis with augmentation charge cutoff of 511.4 eV. The modified Broyden method[193] is used for self-consistency. We carefully check convergence with respect to the number of k-points (up to 32^3=32768) in the Γ-centered Monkhorst-Pack[194] mesh within the tetrahedron method with Blöchl corrections. Gaussian smearing with $\sigma = 0.05\,\text{eV}$ with 16^3=4096 k-points in the 2-atom cell is used for relaxation. The role of the exchange correlation functional was considered in[25,202]. We use PBE-PAW-GGA to provide reasonable agreement with experiment for the lattice constants, compressibilities, and energies. The expected systematic errors in the equilibrium lattice constants $\varepsilon(a) \leq 1\%$, volume $\varepsilon(V) = [\varepsilon(a)]^3 \leq 3\%$, and relative energies $\delta E \leq 1\,\text{meV/atom}$ give an estimate of the error in P_0 not exceeding 0.5 GPa.

There are many EoS for solids[195]. We fit our $E(V)$ data in Fig. 1a to the Birch-Murnaghan[196,197]

$$E(V) = E_0 + \frac{9}{16} V_0 B_0 \left[f^3 B_0' + 2(1-2f) f^2 \right], \qquad (3)$$

with $f = [(V/V_0)^{2/3} - 1]$. For iron, the parameters are given in Table 2 for FM bcc at low pressure, and NM hcp at high pressure. Although hcp at lower pressure and density ($V > 23\,\text{Å}^3$/cell) changes from NM to AFM, their $E(V)$ curves at $V < 21\,\text{Å}^3$ are almost degenerate. These values have some dependence on the range of fitted data, and are affected by the EoS functional form. As expected, calculated volume V_0 is reduced by 3% compared to experiment due to the standard DFT systematic error (i.e., 1% in lattice constants). This DFT error introduces a systematic 3% error (0.25 GPa) in our bcc-hcp coexistence pressure.

	V_0		B_0	B_0'
	$\frac{\text{Å}^3}{\text{cell}}$	$\frac{\text{cm}^3}{\text{mol}}$	GPa	
bcc FM	22.72	6.84	185	4.7
hcp NM	20.34	6.13	293	4.5
hcp AFM	19.94	6.004	140	3.9

TABLE II: Birch-Murnaghan EoS parameters for iron.

Our result for bcc iron is in agreement with the previous DFT calculations[25,198], with B_0 ranging from 171 to 194 GPa from EMTO, VASP, and Wien2K codes, which compare well with the assesses values of 195–205 GPa, see Table 3.1 on p. 47 in[199]. Our EoS coefficients for the hcp single crystal agree with previously calculated ones[200,201] at T=0 K, summarized in Table 1 in[200]. However, the experimentally assessed EoS for hcp martensite with B_0 of 166-195 GPa and B_0' of 4.3-5.3 differs from that calculated for a hcp single crystal (Table 2). This difference is expected because a martensite is a composite with both compressed and dilated regions. Any non-homogeneous distortion increases energy, shifting up and distorting the $E(V)$ curve in Fig. 1a.

IV. DISCUSSION

Transformation from α (bcc) to ε (hcp) iron is martensitic[3], and the hysteresis loop can be characterized by four pressures: $P_{start}^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}$, $P_{end}^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}$, $P_{start}^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}$, and $P_{end}^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}$. In experiment[6,7], ε-phase appears at $P_{start}^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}$ between 8.6 and 15.3 GPa, while α-phase is fully converted above $P_{end}^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}$ between 14 and 25 GPa upon loading. Whereas, upon unloading, α-phase appears at $P_{start}^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}$ between 16 and 7 GPa and ε-phase disappears below $P_{end}^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}$ between 8 and 1 GPa. Importantly, there is no strict inequality between $P_{start}^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}$ and $P_{start}^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}$ due to the martensitic stress distribution in the ε-phase.

Our calculated P_0 of 8.4 GPa is below $P_{start}^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}$ and above $P_{end}^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}$, see inequality (1). It agrees well with the experimental distribution of $P_{start}^{\alpha\to\varepsilon} \geq 8.6\,\text{GPa}$ and $P_{end}^{\varepsilon\to\alpha} \leq 8.5\,\text{GPa}$. The observed $P_{start}^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}$ and $P_{end}^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}$ are highly affected by the martensitic stress within the hcp ε-phase. A martensitic transformation occurs between an isotropic (bcc) austenite and an anisotropic (hcp) martensite, which experience martensitic stress resulting in anisotropic distortions. In other words, there is little internal stress in austenite and large anisotropic internal stresses in martensite. However, martensitic stress is not taken into account in our calculation of the bcc-hcp equilibrium coexistence pressure P_0. Because hcp does not exist below $P_{start}^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}$ and $P_{end}^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}$, these values should not be affected by the martensitic stress in hcp (though the transformation can be delayed due to an energy barrier), and can be used in the proper comparison to experiment.

Hence, P_0 must be between $P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{start}$ and $P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}_{end}$, see inequality (1). These experimental ranges are compared with our calculated value of P_0 in Fig. 1d, with an excellent agreement between theory and experiment.

Elsewhere we will present the energy barriers and transition states via a generalized solid-solid nudged-elastic band that incorporates both volume and magnetization collapse, needed for understanding of the observed abrupt magneto-volume effects. Change of magnetization of the transition state from FM to NM results in the pressure change by $\Delta P = 24\,\mathrm{GPa}$. This calculated ΔP at the transition state agrees with the observed bcc-hcp coexistence interval $[P^{\varepsilon\to\alpha}_{end}, P^{\alpha\to\varepsilon}_{end}]$.

V. SUMMARY

We provide a methodology for comparing idealistic theoretical predictions at hydrostatic pressure to realistic experiments with anisotropic stress, based on inequality 1. For the iron bcc-hcp equilibrium coexistence, our calculated pressure of 8.42 GPa is in agreement with available experimental data. Anisotropic internal stress in the hcp martensite, difference in volume between FM bcc and NM (and competing AFM) hcp iron near the transition state contribute to the spread of the experimentally assessed (non-equilibrium) bcc-hcp coexistence pressures, as well as to the uncertainty in the equation of state of hcp martensite. We emphasized the difference between a single crystal and a martensite and improved understanding of the available data for iron under pressure. Importantly, we suggested a universal inequality (1), graphically illustrated in Fig. 1d, for proper comparison of the assessed and calculated pressures characterizing magneto-structural (martensitic) transformations in many materials.

Acknowledgements

We thank Graeme Henkelman and Iver Anderson for discussion. This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences (BES), Materials Science and Engineering Division. This research was performed at the Ames Laboratory, which is operated for the U.S. DOE by Iowa State University under contract DE-AC02-07CH11358.

References

* Electronic address: zarkev@ameslab.gov; ddj@ameslab.gov

[1] D. Bancroft, E. L. Peterson, and S. Minshall, J. Appl. Phys. 27, 291 (1956).
[2] A. S. Balchan and H. G. Drickamer, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 32, 308 (1961).
[3] P. M. Giles, M. H. Longenbach, and A. R. Marder, J. Appl. Phys. 42, 4290 (1971).
[4] G. Zou, P. M. Bell, and H. K. Mao, in Year Book (Carnegie Institute of Washington, BookCrafters, Inc., Chelsea, Michigan, 1980-1981), Vol. 80, p. 272.
[5] H. K. Mao, W. A. Bassett, and T. Takahashi, J. Appl. Phys. 38, 272 (1967).
[6] W. A. Bassett and E. Huang, Science 238, 780 (1987).
[7] R. Boehler, N. Vonbargen, and A. Chopelas, J. Geophys. Res. 95 (B13), 21731 (1990).
[8] N. B. von Bargen, R. Boehler, High Pressure Res. 6, 133 (1990).
[9] R. D. Taylor, M. P. Pasternak, and R. Jeanloz, J. Appl. Phys. 69, 6126 (1991).
[10] F. Wang, R. Ingalls, and E. D. Crozier, Jpn J. Appl. Phys. 1 32, 749 (1993).
[11] F. M. Wang and R. Ingalls, Phys. Rev. B 57, 5647 (1998).
[12] J. Z. Jiang, J. S. Olsen, and L. Gerward, Mater. Trans. 42, 1571 (2001).
[13] F. Baudelet, S. Pascarelli, O. Mathon, J. P. Itie, A. Polian, M. d' Astuto, and J. C. Chervin, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 17, S957 (2005).
[14] L. Miyagi, M. Kunz, J. Knight, J. Nasiatka, M. Voltolini, and H. R. Wenk, J. Appl. Phys. 104 (2008).
[15] B. Yaakobi, T. R. Boehly, D. D. Meyerhofer, T. J. B. Collins, B. A. Remington, P. G. Allen, S. M. Pollaine, H. E. Lorenzana, and J. H. Eggert, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 075501 (2005).
[16] J. Jung, M. Fricke, G. Hampel, and J. Hesse, Hyperfine Interact. 72, 375 (1992).
[17] M. Ekman, B. Sadigh, K. Einarsdotter, and P. Blaha, Phys. Rev. B 58, 5296 (1998).
[18] M. Sob, M. Friak, L. G. Wang, and V. Vitek, Multiscale Modelling of Materials 538, 523 (1999).
[19] D. F. Johnson and E. A. Carter, J. Chem. Phys. 128, 104703 (2008).
[20] J. B. Liu and D. D. Johnson, Phys. Rev. B 79, 134113 (2009).
[21] J. L. Shao, A. M. He, S. Q. Duan, P. Wang, and C. S. Qin, Acta Phys Sin-Ch Ed 59, 4888 (2010).
[22] B. T. Wang, J. L. Shao, G. C. Zhang, W. D. Li, and P. Zhang, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 21, 495702 (2009).
[23] B. T. Wang, J. L. Shao, G. C. Zhang, W. D. Li, and P. Zhang, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 22, 435404 (2010).
[24] M. Friak and M. Sob, Phys. Rev. B 77, 174117 (2008).
[25] L. Vocadlo, G. A. de Wijs, G. Kresse, M. Gillan, and G. D. Price, Faraday Discuss. 106, 205–218 (1997).
[26] K. J. Caspersen, A. Lew, M. Ortiz, and E. A. Carter, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 115501 (2004).
[27] N. Suzuki, T. Souraku, I. Hamada, and T. Takezawa, High Pressure Res. 22, 451 (2002).
[28] L. Stixrude and R. E. Cohen, High-Pressure Science and Technology - 1993, Parts 1 and 2, 911 (1994).
[29] V. Potapkin, C. McCammon, K. Glazyrin, A. Kantor, I. Kupenko, C. Prescher, R. Sinmyo, G.V. Smirnov, A.I. Chumakov, R. Rüffer, L. Dubrovinsky, Nat. Commun. 4,

1427 (2013).
[30] M. Pozzo, C. Davies, D. Gubbins, and D. Alfé, Nature 485, 355 (2012).
[31] D. Andrault, S. Petitgirard, G. Lo Nigro, J. L. Devidal, G. Veronesi, G. Garbarino, and M. Mezouar, Nature 487, 354 (2012).
[32] R. Nomura, H. Ozawa, S. Tateno, K. Hirose, J. Hernlund, S. Muto, H. Ishii, and N. Hiraoka, Nature 473, 199 (2011).
[33] J. R. Rustad and Q. Z. Yin, Nat. Geosci. 2, 514 (2009).
[34] J. F. Lin, V. V. Struzhkin, S. D. Jacobsen, M. Y. Hu, P. Chow, J. Kung, H. Z. Liu, H. K. Mao, and R. J. Hemley, Nature 436, 377 (2005).
[35] J. H. Nguyen and N. C. Holmes, Nature 427, 339 (2004).
[36] D. J. Frost, C. Liebske, F. Langenhorst, C. A. McCammon, R. G. Tronnes, and D. C. Rubie, Nature 428, 409 (2004).
[37] L. Vocadlo, D. Alfé, M. J. Gillan, I. G. Wood, J. P. Brodholt, and G. D. Price, Nature 424, 536 (2003).
[38] L. Dubrovinsky et al., Nature 422, 58 (2003).
[39] L. Dubrovinsky et al., Science 316, 1880 (2007).
[40] A. B. Belonoshko, R. Ahuja, and B. Johansson, Nature 424, 1032 (2003).
[41] A. B. Belonoshko, N. V. Skorodumova, A. Rosengren, B. Johansson, Science 319, 797 (2008).
[42] G. Steinle-Neumann, L. Stixrude, R. E. Cohen, and O. Gulseren, Nature 413, 57 (2001).
[43] H. R. Wenk, S. Matthies, R. J. Hemley, H. K. Mao, and J. Shu, Nature 405, 1044 (2000).
[44] S. C. Singh and J. P. Montagner, Nature 400, 629 (1999).
[45] H. K. Mao, J. F. Shu, G. Y. Shen, R. J. Hemley, B. S. Li, and A. K. Singh, Nature 399, 280 (1999).
[46] D. Alfé, M. J. Gillan, and G. D. Price, Nature 401, 462 (1999).
[47] H. K. Mao, J. F. Shu, G. Y. Shen, R. J. Hemley, B. S. Li, and A. K. Singh, Nature 396, 741 (1998).
[48] G. A. de Wijs, G. Kresse, L. Vocadlo, D. Dobson, D. Alfé, M. J. Gillan, and G. D. Price, Nature 392, 805 (1998).
[49] D. P. Summers and S. Chang, Nature 365, 630 (1993).
[50] A. Jephcoat and P. Olson, Nature 325, 332 (1987).
[51] Y. Fukai, Nature 308, 174 (1984).
[52] S. Anzellini, A. Dewaele, M. Mezouar, P. Loubeyre, and G. Morard, Science 340, 464 (2013).
[53] A. S. Cote, L. Vocadlo, and J. P. Brodholt, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 345, 126 (2012).
[54] S. Tateno, K. Hirose, Y. Ohishi, and Y. Tatsumi, Science 330, 359 (2010).
[55] W. Luo, B. Johansson, O. Eriksson, S. Arapan, P. Souvatzis, M. I. Katsnelson, and R. Ahuja, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 107, 9962 (2010).
[56] T. Irifune, T. Shinmei, C. A. McCammon, N. Miyajima, D. C. Rubie, and D. J. Frost, Science 327, 193 (2010).
[57] X. L. Sun and X. D. Song, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 269, 56 (2008).
[58] Y. Kuwayama, K. Hirose, N. Sata, and Y. Ohishi, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 273, 379 (2008).
[59] B. Chen, L. L. Gao, K. Funakoshi, and J. Li, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 104 (22), 9162 (2007).
[60] P. Modak, A. K. Verma, R. S. Rao, B. K. Godwal, and R. Jeanloz, J. Mater. Sci. 41, 1523 (2006).
[61] S. Speziale, A. Milner, V. E. Lee, S. M. Clark, M. P. Pasternak, and R. Jeanloz, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 102, 17918 (2005).
[62] J. Badro, G. Fiquet, F. Guyot, J. P. Rueff, V. V. Struzhkin, G. Vanko, and G. Monaco, Science 300, 789 (2003).
[63] J. F. Lin, D. L. Heinz, A. J. Campbell, J. M. Devine, and G. Y. Shen, Science 295, 313 (2002).
[64] S. Merkel, A. F. Goncharov, H. K. Mao, P. Gillet, and R. J. Hemley, Science 288, 1626 (2000).
[65] A. Laio, S. Bernard, G. L. Chiarotti, S. Scandolo, and E. Tosatti, Science 287, 1027 (2000).
[66] T. Okuchi, Science 278, 1781 (1997).
[67] C. S. Yoo, J. Akella, A. J. Campbell, H. K. Mao, and R. J. Hemley, Science 270, 1473 (1995).
[68] F. Birch, Am. J. Sci. 238, 192 (1940).
[69] L. Stixrude and R. E. Cohen, Science 267, 1972 (1995).
[70] M. Pozzo, C. Davies, D. Gubbins, and D. Alfé, Phys. Rev. B 87 (2013).
[71] L. V. Pourovskii, T. Miyake, S. I. Simak, A. V. Ruban, L. Dubrovinsky, and I. A. Abrikosov, Phys. Rev. B 87 (2013).
[72] B. Martorell, J. Brodholt, I. G. Wood, and L. Vocadlo, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 365, 143 (2013).
[73] K. A. Evans, T. C. McCuaig, D. Leach, T. Angerer, and S. G. Hagemann, Geology 41, 99 (2013).
[74] A. M. Mloszewska, E. Pecoits, N. L. Cates, S. J. Mojzsis, J. O'Neil, L. J. Robbins, and K. O. Konhauser, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 317, 331 (2012).
[75] Y. N. Wu, D. M. Wang, and Y. S. Huang, AIP Advances 1, 032122 (2011).
[76] G. L. Weerasinghe, R. J. Needs, and C. J. Pickard, Phys. Rev. B 84 (2011).
[77] K. G. Taylor and K. O. Konhauser, Elements 7, 83 (2011).
[78] M. Tamura, J. Japan Inst. Metals 75 (1), 1–4 (2011).
[79] J. Persson, C. Desgranges, and J. Delhommelle, Chem. Phys. Lett. 511, 57 (2011). doi: 10.1016/j.cplett.2011.06.018
[80] O. Narygina, L. S. Dubrovinsky, C. A. McCammon, A. Kurnosov, I. Y. Kantor, V. B. Prakapenka, and N. A. Dubrovinskaia, Earth Planet Sci. Lett. 307, 409 (2011).
[81] Z. Mao, J. F. Lin, H. P. Scott, H. C. Watson, V. B. Prakapenka, Y. Xiao, P. Chow, and C. McCammon, Earth Planet Sci. Lett. 309, 179 (2011).
[82] T. Ishikawa, T. Tsuchiya, and J. Tsuchiya, Phys. Rev. B 83 (2011).
[83] T. Komabayashi and Y. W. Fei, J. Geophys. Res. 115, B03202 (2010).
[84] L. Dubrovinsky, J. F. Lin, and N. Dubrovinskaia, "Mineral physics of Earth core: iron alloys at extreme condition," in "High-Pressure Crystallography," p. 35 (Springer, 2010). doi: 10.1007/978-90-481-9258-8_4.
[85] A. S. Cote, L. Vocadlo, D. P. Dobson, D. Alfé, and J. P. Brodholt, Phys. Earth Planet. In. 178, 2 (2010).
[86] L. Koci, A. B. Belonoshko, and R. Ahuja, Geophys. J. Int. 168, 890 (2007).
[87] A. B. Belonoshko and A. Rosengren, Geochim. Cosmochim. Ac. 74, A75 (2010).
[88] A. B. Belonoshko, T. Bryk, and A. Rosengren, Phys. Rev. Lett. 104, 245703 (2010).
[89] H. Asanuma, E. Ohtani, T. Sakai, H. Terasaki, S. Kamada, T. Kondo, and T. Kikegawa, Phys. Chem. Minerals 37, 353 (2010).
[90] D. Alfé, Rev. Mineral. Geochem. 71, 337 (2010).
[91] M. Walter, O. Lord, G. Helffrich, and D. Walker, Geochim. Cosmochim. Ac. 73, A1405 (2009).
[92] E. Sola, J. P. Brodholt, and D. Alfé, Phys. Rev. B 79 (2009).
[93] E. Sola and D. Alfé, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103 (2009).

[94] D. E. Smylie, V. V. Brazhkin, and A. Palmer, Phys-Usp+ 52, 79 (2009).
[95] K. Kadas, L. Vitos, B. Johansson, and R. Ahuja, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 106, 15560 (2009).
[96] T. Ishikawa, J. Tsuchiya, and T. Tsuchiya, Geochim. Cosmochim. Ac. 73, A573 (2009).
[97] D. Alfé, Phys. Rev. B 79 (2009).
[98] M. Mattesini, E. Buforn, A. Udias, L. Vitos, and R. Ahuja, High Pressure Res. 28, 437 (2008).
[99] J. F. Lin and T. Tsuchiya, Phys. Earth Planet. In. 170, 248 (2008).
[100] Y. H. Li, K. J. Hou, and D. F. Wan, Geochim. Cosmochim. Ac. 72, A548 (2008).
[101] J. Li, L. Gao, B. Chen, E. Alp, J. Zhao, and K. Hirose, Geochim. Cosmochim. Ac. 72, A541 (2008).
[102] K. Kadas, L. Vitos, and R. Ahuja, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 271, 221 (2008).
[103] G. J. Golabek, H. Schmeling, and P. J. Tackley, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 271, 24 (2008).
[104] A. S. Cote, L. Vocadlo, and J. P. Brodholt, J. Phys. Chem. Solids 69, 2177 (2008).
[105] D. K. Belashchenko, N. E. Kravchunovskaya, and O. I. Ostrovski, Inorganic Materials 44, 248 (2008).
[106] A. K. Singh, Phys. Earth Planet. In. 164, 75 (2007).
[107] K. Shigemori, D. Ichinose, T. Irifune, K. Otani, T. Shiota, T. Sakaiya, and H. Azechi, Eur. Phys. J. D 44, 301 (2007).
[108] P. Modak, A. K. Verma, R. S. Rao, B. K. Godwal, L. Stixrude, and R. Jeanloz, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 19 (2007).
[109] M. A. Bouhifd, L. Gautron, N. Bolfan-Casanova, V. Malavergne, T. Hammouda, D. Andrault, and A. P. Jephcoat, Phys. Earth Planet. In. 160, 22 (2007).
[110] J. Badro, G. Fiquet, F. Guyot, E. Gregoryanz, F. Occelli, D. Antonangeli, and M. d'Astuto, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 254, 233 (2007).
[111] F. W. Zhang and A. R. Oganov, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 249, 436 (2006).
[112] K. Shigemori, D. Ichinose, T. Irifune, K. Otani, T. Shiota, T. Sakaiya, and H. Azechi, J. Phys. IV France 133, 37–41 (2006). doi: 10.1051/jp4:2006133008
[113] K. Shigemori, A. Ichinose, T. Irifune, K. Otani, T. Shiota, T. Sakaiya, and H. Azechi, Shock Compression of Condensed Matter, Parts 1 and 2, 845, 1480 (2006).
[114] K. K. M. Lee and G. Steinle-Neumann, J. Geophys. Res. 111 (2006).
[115] J. Badro, G. Fiquet, and F. Guyot, Geochim. Cosmochim. Ac. 70, A28 (2006).
[116] W. Sturhahn, J. M. Jackson, and J. F. Lin, Geophys. Res. Lett. 32 (2005).
[117] G. Schmidt, H. Palme, and K. L. Kratz, Meteorit. Planet. Sci. 40, A135 (2005).
[118] V. N. Mineev and A. I. Funtikov, Izvestiya, Phys. Solid Earth (Fizika Zemli) 41, 539 (2005).
[119] J. F. Lin, V. V. Struzhkin, S. D. Jacobsen, G. Y. Shen, V. B. Prakapenka, H. K. Mao, and R. J. Hemley, J. Synchrotron Radiat. 12, 637 (2005).
[120] C. M. S. Gannarelli, D. Alfé, and M. J. Gillan, Phys. Earth Planet. In. 152, 67 (2005).
[121] S. Weyer, A. Woodland, C. Munker, G. L. Arnold, R. Chakrabarti, and A. D. Anbar, Geochim. Cosmochim. Ac. 68, A736 (2004).
[122] J. Shanker, B. P. Singh, and S. K. Srivastava, Phys. Earth Planet. In. 147, 333 (2004).
[123] Y. Z. Ma, M. Somayazulu, G. Y. Shen, H. K. Mao, J. F. Shu, and R. J. Hemley, Phys. Earth Planet. In. 143, 455 (2004).
[124] K. K. M. Lee, G. Steinle-Neumann, and R. Jeanloz, Geophys. Res. Lett. 31 (2004).
[125] N. Hirao, T. Kondo, E. Ohtani, K. Takemura, and T. Kikegawa, Geophys. Res. Lett. 31 (2004).
[126] D. J. Frost, C. Liebske, C. A. McCammon, F. Langenhorst, R. Tronnes, and D. C. Rubie, Lithos 73, S38 (2004).
[127] Y. Kato, Geochim. Cosmochim. Ac. 67, A204 (2003).
[128] C. M. Johnson, B. L. Beard, N. J. Beukes, C. Klein, and J. M. O'Leary, Contrib. Mineral. Petrol. 144, 523 (2003).
[129] G. E. Grechnev, R. Ahuja, and O. Eriksson, Phys. Rev. B 68 (2003).
[130] B. L. Beard, C. M. Johnson, K. L. Von Damm, and R. L. Poulson, Geology 31, 629 (2003).
[131] Y. Wang, R. Ahuja, and B. Johansson, J. Phys.-Condens. Mat. 14, 7321 (2002).
[132] Y. Wang, R. Ahuja, and B. Johansson, Phys. Rev. B 65 (2002).
[133] J. F. Lin, D. L. Heinz, A. J. Campbell, J. M. Devine, W. L. Mao, and G. Y. Shen, Geophys. Res. Lett. 29 (2002).
[134] B. L. Beard, C. M. Johnson, and K. L. Von Damm, Geochim. Cosmochim. Ac. 66, A58 (2002).
[135] D. Alfé, G. D. Price, and M. J. Gillan, Phys. Rev. B 65 (2002).
[136] C. Yapp, Annu. Rev. Earth Pl. Sc. 29, 165 (2001).
[137] R. J. Hemley and H. K. Mao, Int. Geol. Rev. 43, 1–26 (2001).
[138] A. I. Funtikov, Izvestiya, Phys. Solid Earth (Fizika Zemli) 37, 703 (2001).
[139] D. Alfé, G. D. Price, and M. J. Gillan, Phys. Rev. B 64 (2001).
[140] Y. G. Zhang and G. J. Guo, Phys. Earth Planet. In. 122, 289 (2000).
[141] I. Jackson, J. D. Fitz Gerald, and H. Kokkonen, J. Geophys. Res. 105, 23605 (2000).
[142] A. I. Funtikov, Izvestiya, Phys. Solid Earth [Fizika Zemli] 36, 958 (2000).
[143] D. Alfé, G. Kresse, and M. J. Gillan, Phys. Rev. B 61, 132 (2000).
[144] L. Vocadlo, J. Brodholt, D. Alfé, G. D. Price, and M. J. Gillan, Geophys. Res. Lett. 26, 1231 (1999).
[145] J. P. Poirier and G. D. Price, Phys. Earth Planet. In. 110, 147 (1999).
[146] L. Stixrude, E. Wasserman, and R. E. Cohen, Geophysical Monograph Series 101, 159 (1998).
[147] T. Okuchi, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 10, 11595 (1998).
[148] F. Guyot, J. H. Zhang, I. Martinez, J. Matas, Y. Ricard, and M. Javoy, Eur J Mineral 9, 277 (1997).
[149] P. Soderlind, J. A. Moriarty, and J. M. Wills, Phys. Rev. B 53, 14063 (1996).
[150] J. P. Poirier, A. Goddat, and J. Peyronneau, Philos T R Soc A 354, 1361 (1996).
[151] I. Suzuki, et al., High-Pressure Science and Technology – 1993, Pts. 1 and 2, 935 (1994).
[152] C. S. Yoo, N. C. Holmes, M. Ross, D. J. Webb, and C. Pike, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 3931 (1993).
[153] Y. Hirayama, T. Fujii, and K. Kurita, Geophys. Res. Lett. 20, 2095 (1993).
[154] M. Ross, D. A. Young, and R. Grover, J. Geophys. Res. 95, 21713 (1990).
[155] D. A. Boness and J. M. Brown, J. Geophys. Res. 95, 21721 (1990).
[156] O. L. Anderson, J. Geophys. Res. 95, 21697 (1990).

[157] D. A. Boness, J. M. Brown, and A. K. Mcmahan, Phys. Earth Planet. In. 42, 227 (1986).
[158] I. S. Kulikov, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Metally [Russ. Metall.], 6, 9–15 (1985).
[159] V. K. Levashov and B. V. Oleinikov, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 278, 719 (1984).
[160] V. N. Zharkov, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 135, 1378 (1960).
[161] B. P. Krotov, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 121, 326 (1958).
[162] W. Westphal, Naturwissenschaften 10, 260 (1922).
[163] E. Wilson, P. Roy. Soc. Lond. A Mat. 90, 179 (1914).
[164] J. J. Yang, J. I. Goldstein, and E. R. D. Scott, Nature 446, 888 (2007).
[165] F. Paneth, W. D. Urry, and W. Koeck, Nature 125, 490–491 (1930).
[166] M. I. Oshtrakh, M. Y. Larionov, V. I. Grokhovsky, and V. A. Semionkin, Meteorit. Planet. Sci. 47, A305 (2012).
[167] L. V. Agafonov, V. A. Popov, G. N. Anoshin, L. N. Pospelova, V. I. Zabelin, and V. I. Kudryavtsev, Russ. Geol. Geophys. 52, 620 (2011).
[168] M. I. Oshtrakh, M. Y. Larionov, V. I. Grokhovsky, and V. A. Semionkin, Mater. Chem. Phys. 130, 373 (2011).
[169] M. I. Oshtrakh, V. I. Grokhovsky, N. V. Abramova, V. A. Semionkin, and O. B. Milder, Isiame 2008, 317 (2009).
[170] C. Van Cromphaut, V. G. De Resende, E. De Grave, and R. E. Vandenberghe, Meteorit. Planet. Sci. 42, 2119 (2007).
[171] I. Casanova, T. Graf, and K. Marti, Science 268, 540 (1995).
[172] A. N. Krot, N. I. Zaslavskay, M. I. Petaev, N. N. Kononkova, G. M. Kolesov, and L. D. Barsukova, Meteoritics 27, 465 (1992).
[173] B. Mason, Am. Sci. 55 (4), 429 (1967).
[174] K. Bugayev, Y. Bychkov, Y. Konovalov, V. Kovalenko, E. Tretyakov, "Iron and Steel Production" (MIR, Moscow, 1971). ISBN: 0-89499-109-4.
[175] V. D. Blank, Y. Y. Boguslavsky, M. I. Eremets, E. S. Itskevich, Y. S. Konyaev, A. M. Shirokov, and E. I. Estrin, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 87, 922 (1984).
[176] S. Sasaki, R. Ishiguro, F. Caupin, H. J. Maris, S. Balibar, Science 313, 1098–1100 (2006).
[177] K.O. Keshishev, A. Ya. Parshin, A.V. Babkin, JETP Lett. 30, 5659 (1979).
[178] P. Kapitza, Nature 141, 74 (1938).
[179] A. B. Belonoshko and R. Ahuja, Phys. Earth Planet. In. 102, 171 (1997).
[180] A. B. Belonoshko, S. Arapan, and A. Rosengren, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 23, 485402 (2011).
[181] L. Koci, A. B. Belonoshko, and R. Ahuja, Phys. Rev. B 73 (2006).
[182] A. B. Belonoshko, P. I. Dorogokupets, B. Johansson, S. K. Saxena, and L. Koci, Phys. Rev. B 78 (2008).
[183] A. B. Belonoshko, Condens. Matter Phys. 13 (2), 23605 (2010).
[184] D. Sheppard, P. H. Xiao, W. Chemelewski, D. D. Johnson, and G. Henkelman, J. Chem. Phys. 136, 074103 (2012).
[185] B. Dupe, B. Amadon, Y. P. Pellegrini, and C. Denoual, Phys. Rev. B 87, 024103 (2013).
[186] G. Kresse and J. Hafner, Phys. Rev. B 49, 14251 (1994).
[187] G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, Phys. Rev. B 54, 11169 (1996).
[188] G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, Comp Mater Sci 6, 15 (1996).
[189] J. P. Perdew, J. A. Chevary, S. H. Vosko, K. A. Jackson, M. R. Pederson, D. J. Singh, and C. Fiolhais, Phys. Rev. B 46, 6671 (1992).
[190] J. P. Perdew, Phys Lett A 165, 79 (1992).
[191] P. E. Blöchl, Phys. Rev. B 50, 17953 (1994).
[192] G. Kresse and D. Joubert, Phys. Rev. B 59, 1758 (1999).
[193] D. D. Johnson, Phys. Rev. B 38, 12807 (1988).
[194] H. J. Monkhorst and J. D. Pack, Phys. Rev. B 13, 5188 (1976).
[195] V. N. Zharkov and V. A. Kalinin, Equations of state for solids at high pressures and temperatures (Consultants Bureau, New York, 1971).
[196] F. D. Murnaghan, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 30, 244 (1944).
[197] F. Birch, Phys. Rev. 71, 809 (1947).
[198] H. L. Zhang, S. Lu, M. P. J. Punkkinen, Q. M. Hu, B. Johansson, and L. Vitos, Phys. Rev. B 82 (2010).
[199] N.V. Kadobnova and A.M. Bratkovskii, Mechanical Properties of Materials (Chapter 3), in Fizicheskie Velichiny (ed. I.S. Grigoryev, E.Z. Meylikhov), Moscow, EnergoAtomIzdat (1991). ISBN 5-283-04013-5.
[200] X. W. Sha and R. E. Cohen, Phys. Rev. B 81 (2010).
[201] G. Steinle-Neumann, L. Stixrude, and R. E. Cohen, Phys. Rev. B 60, 791 (1999).
[202] P. Haas, F. Tran, and P. Blaha, Phys. Rev. B 79, 085104 (2009).